

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 6-24 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider her rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Entry of Amendment

The present amendment is being submitted with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Entry of the amendment is considered to be proper and should be given full consideration in view of the filing of the RCE.

Telephone Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the telephone interview conducted with Examiner Pham on June 24, 2004. No agreement was reached during the interview concerning allowable subject matter. However, the Examiner did suggest that the functioning of the self-lubricating bearing be discussed. Applicants are submitting the present amendment along with a Request for Continued Examination in order to better describe the functioning of the self-lubricating bearing and to better differentiate over the prior art.

Changes to the Specification

Applicants have amended the specification in paragraphs 9, 25, 27, 28, and 33 in order to better describe the invention. In particular, Applicants have provided a better description of the self-lubricating bearing 50 and its operation. Applicants submit that this description is based on existing descriptions found in the specification, drawings, and claims, for example in the last part of paragraph 28 of the original specification. The additional description in the specification emphasizes that the bearing supports the rotation shaft to maintain the rotor and stator in their equilibrium positions and to limit the motion of the rotor in the axial direction. Applicants submit that this description is based on the original disclosure and that this additional descriptive material is not new matter.

Changes to the Drawings

Applicants are also submitting herewith a replacement sheet for Figure 3, which adds reference to numeral 43. This addition is also considered not to be new matter since this referenced numeral is present in Figure 4.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Jeong (USP 6,420,810) in view of Horng (USP 6,435,722). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First of all, in regard to claims 1-5, these claims have been cancelled, rendering this rejection moot.

In regard to independent claims 6 and 11, Applicants wish to point out that these claims have been amended to now add the limitation that the self-lubricating bearing supports the rotation shaft to limit the rotation shaft along the axial direction. This additional limitation has been added in response to the interview with the Examiner mentioned above where the Examiner suggested pointing out the functioning of the bearing.

It is pointed out that the Jeong reference shows magnetic bearings in both the axial and radial directions. The Examiner admits that Jeong fails to teach a bearing fastened to the bearing seat of the base being a self-lubricating bearing. The Examiner cited Horng to show a combination of an oil-impregnated bearing fastened to a bearing seat to support the motor. The Examiner feels that it would have been obvious to modify Jeong's magnetic bearing structure with the self-lubricating bearing taught by Horng. Applicants submit that this combination of references do not render claim 6 and 11 obvious. These claims now make it clear that the self-lubricating bearing is fastened to the bearing seat

to accommodate and support the rotation shaft so as to limit the movement of the shaft along the axial direction.

In Jeong, the magnetic bearings 60 and 70, which were placed on the shaft, do not limit the movement of the shaft in the axial direction and do not support the shaft. In Horng, bearing 2 is also not designed to limit the movement of the shaft along the axial direction. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the combination of these two references does not teach the terms of claims 6 and 11, which describe the self-lubricating bearing as supporting the rotation shaft to limit the shaft along the axial direction. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 6 and 11 are allowable.

Claims 7-10 and 12-15 depend from these allowable independent claims and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition these claims further recite other features of the invention which make these claims additionally allowable. Thus, these claims include a description of the various magnetic elements and their relationship.

New claims 16-18 also depend from these allowable independent claims and are also considered to be allowable. These claims further describe the balancing position between the magnetic repulsive forces and the wind force and also describe a relationship between the magnetic elements to limit the shift range

of the shaft. Accordingly, these claims are considered to be additionally allowable.

New claim 19 has also been added which describe a fan assembly including the fan blades and the motor elements. The assembly also describes a bearing for accommodating and supporting the rotation shaft to limit the shaft along the axial direction, in the same fashion as claim 6 and 11. Accordingly, this claim is also considered to be allowable.

Claims 20-24 depend from this allowable independent claim and as such are also considered to be allowable. These claims also describe the relationship between various magnetic elements. Accordingly, these claims are considered to be additionally allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse (Reg. No. 27,295) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview

in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Joe McKinney Muncy, #32,334

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

 KM/RFG:cms
3626-0255PUS1

Attachment(s): Drawing Replacement Sheet